

NEW YORK, NY 10018

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/928,143 08/10/2001 218.1019 Anton Leherbauer 6464 EXAMINER 7590 08/26/2004 CARY S. KAPPEL INGBERG, TODD D DAVIDSON DAVIDSON & KAPPEL LLC ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **485 SEVENTH AVENUE** 14TH FLOOR 2124

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<u> </u>	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/928,143	LEHERBAUER, ANTON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Todd Ingberg	2124	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appearing for Reply	pears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a ly within the statutory minimum of th will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 J	<u>lune 2000</u> .		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under a	· ·	• •	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2002 is/are:		hiected to by the Examiner	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea	ts have been received. ts have been received in a prity documents have bee	Application No	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies no	t received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5. Patent and Trademark Office	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2124

~ ¢

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 - 33 have been examined.

Oath/Declaration

1. It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration acknowledges the duty to disclose to the Office all information known to the person to be material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR 1.56. Applicant has elected to select portions of 37 CFR 1.56. The United States Patent Office does not offer this as an option.

Drawings

2. The drawings were received on August 10, 2002. These drawings are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101. The clear explanation is that the claims fail the concrete and tangible tests. The following correction is suggested.

Claim 1

A method <u>executing on a computer readable medium</u> for integrating a version control tool into an integrated development environment, the method comprising: receiving a version control command; creating an object using the integrated development environment, the object including command information corresponding to the version control command; accessing the object using a version control adapter; and communicating the command information from the version control adapter to the version control tool.

Claim 17

A software system <u>executing on a computer readable medium</u> comprising: an object including command information corresponding to a version control command; an integrated development environment including a configuration management service configured to create the object; and a version control adapter capable of accessing the object and communicating the command information to a version control tool.

Art Unit: 2124

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Visual Source Safe (VSS) this manual documenting version 5.0 of a released commercial product was published in 1997 in view of the commercial product ClearCase by Atria from 1994.

Claim 1

VSS teaches a method for integrating a version control tool into an integrated development environment (VSS, Chapter 13, Integration, pages 175 – 176), the method comprising: receiving a version control command (VSS, Chapter 14, Command Line Tools, pages 185 to 187) accessing the object using a version control adapter (version control adapter is interpreted to be the Application Program Interface (API) between the VSS product and the IDE products such as Visual C++, Visual Basic etc. VSS, pages 176 and 180 the ability for VSS to communicate with the different IDEs is made possible by an API – the reference teaches this limitation of the presence of an API to enable this functionality); and communicating the command information from the version control adapter to the version control tool (VSS, pages 188 – 193 Using the Command Line).

VSS discloses the use of storing of versions in a data store the data store used is a file. ClearCase stores versions in a data store. The data store ClearCase uses is an object. The following limitations are taught by ClearCase; creating an object using the integrated development environment (ClearCase, page 4 – 5, VOBs described), the object including command information corresponding to the version control command(ClearCase, page 13 Check In and Check Out are commands);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of **VSS** and **ClearCase** to modify the integration of version control of **VSS** to store versions using the Version Object Base (VOB), because "VOBs can be distributed throughout a local area network" (**ClearCase**, last line page 2 to top of page 3).

Claim 2

The method as recited in claim 1 further comprising receiving an indication of a file associated with the version control command before the receiving of the version control command and wherein the creating of the object is performed so as to further include file information corresponding to the file. (ClearCase, page 9, Environment management, setup the project prior to commands)

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 3

The method as recited in claim 1 further comprising receiving an indication of a file associated with the version control command after the receiving of the version control command and herein the creating of the object is performed so as to further include file information corresponding to the file. (ClearCase, page 70, Check In is a command for VOB).

Claim 4

The method as recited in claim 3 wherein the file information includes a file name and a path name of the file. (ClearCase, page 8, Figure 5)

Claim 5

The method as recited in claim 4 wherein the file information further includes a working environment and a configuration specification of the file. (ClearCase, pages 14-15, Configuration records).

Claim 6

The method as recited in claim 1 further comprising implementing the version control command (ClearCase, page 33, Check In and Out are commands) using the version control tool. (ClearCase, page 25, version control).

Claim 7

The method as recited in claim 1 wherein the version control adapter is written in a Python programming language.

Examiner's Remark's – Why the programming language the adapter was written should be given patentable weight is in question. Since, the runtime executable is binary and the linking of binary code regardless of the language is grossly old and well known). The programming language make no distinction.

Claim 8

The method as recited in claim 1 wherein the integrated development environment is written in a C++ programming language. (VSS page 10 teaches the integration of the tool with C++).

Claim 9

The method as recited in claim 1 further comprising providing a dialogue using the version control adapter so as to obtain a user input from a user. (VSS, as per claim 1 and the commands as per page 186 and ClearCase, page 70 Scenarios).

Claim 10

The method as recited in claim 9 wherein the communicating the information from the version control adapter to the version control tool is performed so as to communicate the user input from the version control adapter to the version control tool. As per the rejection of claim 9.

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 14

The method as recited in claim 1 further comprising communicating information from the version control tool to the integrated development environment using the version control adapter. As per the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 15

The method as recited in claim 1 wherein the accessing of the object is performed using a wrapper object. (ClearCase, page 65, the filter is a form of a wrapper).

Claim 16

The method as recited in claim 1 wherein the version control adapter resides outside of the integrated development environment. As per claim 1 the **ClearCase** ability to be distributed supports the external existence of the version control adapter.

Claim 17

VSS teaches a software system comprising: an integrated development environment (VSS, Chapter 13, Integration, pages 175 – 176) including a configuration management service configured to create the object (ClearCase, page 4 – 5, VOBs described); and a version control adapter capable of accessing the object and communicating the command information to a version control tool(ClearCase, page 13 Check In and Check Out are commands).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of **VSS** and **ClearCase** to modify the integration of version control of **VSS** to store versions using the Version Object Base (VOB), because "VOBs can be distributed throughout a local area network" (**ClearCase**, last line page 2 to top of page 3).

Claim 18

The software system as recited in claim 17 wherein both the integrated development system and the version control adapter are written using an object oriented programming language. (ClearCase, page 4-5, VOBs).

Claim 19

The software system as recited in claim 18 wherein the integrated development environment is written in a C++ programming language and the version control adapter is written in a Python programming language. As per the rejections of claims 6 and 7.

Claim 20

The software system as recited in claim 17 wherein the object further includes file information corresponding to a file selected by a user. (ClearCase, page, pages 33 - 43).

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 21

The software system as recited in claim 20 wherein the file information includes a file name and a path name of the file. As per the rejection of claim 4.

Claim 22

The software system as recited in claim 21 wherein the file information further includes a working environment and a configuration specification of the file. As per the rejection of claim 5.

Claim 23

The software system as recited in claim 17 wherein the version control adapter is written in a Python programming language. As per the rejection of claim 7.

Claim 24

The software system as recited in claim 17 wherein the integrated development environment is written in a C++ programming language. As per the rejection of claim 7.

Claim 25

The software system as recited in claim 17 wherein the version control adapter is capable of being used to provide a dialogue so as to obtain a user input from a user. As per the rejection of claim 9.

Claim 26

The software system as recited in claim 25 wherein the version control adapter is capable of communicating the user input to the version control tool. As per the rejection of claim 9.

Claim 30

The software system as recited in claim 17 wherein the version control adapter is capable of communicating information from the version control tool to the integrated development environment. As per the rejection of claim 16.

Claim 31

The software system as recited in claim 17 further comprising a wrapper object adapted for use by the version control tool for accessing the object. As per the rejection for claim 15.

Claim 32

The software system as recited in claim 17 wherein the version control adapter resides outside of the integrated development environment. As per the rejection for claim 16.

Claim 33

VSS teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable process steps operative to perform a method for integrating a version control tool into an integrated development environment (VSS, Chapter 13, Integration, pages 175 - 176), the process steps

Art Unit: 2124

comprising: receiving a version control command (VSS, Chapter 14, Command Line Tools, pages 185 to 187); accessing the object (data store) using a version control adapter (version control adapter is interpreted to be the Application Program Interface (API) between the VSS product and the IDE products such as Visual C++, Visual Basic etc. VSS, pages 176 and 180 the ability for VSS to communicate with the different IDEs is made possible by an API – the reference teaches this limitation of the presence of an API to enable this functionality); and communicating the command information from the version control adapter to the version control tool(VSS, pages 188 – 193 Using the Command Line).

VSS discloses the use of storing of versions in a data store the data store used is a file. ClearCase stores versions in a data store. The data store ClearCase uses is an object. The following limitations are taught by ClearCase; creating an object using the integrated development environment (ClearCase, page 4-5, VOBs described),; creating an object using the integrated development environment, the object including command information corresponding to the version control command (ClearCase, page 13 Check In and Check Out are commands)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of **VSS** and **ClearCase** to modify the integration of version control of **VSS** to store versions using the Version Object Base (VOB), because "VOBs can be distributed throughout a local area network" (**ClearCase**, last line page 2 to top of page 3).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 11- 13 and 27 - 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Both references Visual Source Safe and ClearCase are silent as to the processing of error messages. Examiner recollection of Visual Source Safe 5.0 producing error messages to the Visual Source Safe environment. However, the Examiner's recollection is over six one half years old and not clear enough to support an affidavit. In re Zurko forbids Examiner from the use of common sense.

Claim 11

The method as recited in claim 6 further comprising receiving errors generated by the version control tool while implementing the version control command.

Claim 12

Art Unit: 2124

The method as recited in claim 11 further comprising generating an error dialogue using the version control adapter so as to obtain an error response input.

Claim 13

The method as recited in claim 12 further comprising communicating the error response input directly to the version control tool using the version control adapter and without using the integrated development environment.

Claim 27

The software system as recited in claim 17 wherein the version control adapter is configured to receive an error from the version control tool.

Claim 28

The software system as recited in claim 27 wherein the version control adapter is capable of generating an error dialogue in response to the error to obtain an error response input.

Claim 29

The software system as recited in claim 28 wherein the version control adapter is capable of communicating the error response input directly to the version control tool without using the integrated development environment.

Correspondence Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Todd Ingberg** whose telephone number is (703) 305-9775. The examiner can normally be reached during the following hours:

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
6:15 – 1:30	6:15-3:45	6:15 – 4:45	6:15-3:45	6:15-130

This schedule began December 1, 2003 and is subject to change.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Kakali Chaki** can be reached on (703) 305-9662. Please, note that as of August 4, 2003 the **FAX number** changed for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2124

Also, be advised the United States Patent Office new address is

Post Office Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

Special Notice

9. Please, Note the Examiner's telephone number will change in October when the Art Unit moves to the new location. The Examiner's new telephone number will be as follows:

(571) 272-3723

Todd Ingberg / Primary Examiner Art Unit 2124 August 20, 2004